

Remarks

All independent claim, (1, 17 and 34) have been amended to emphasize that it is **the text and data** content of the automatically generated communication that is automatically changed depending upon the characteristic of the chosen media so that differences in text and data content between communications are identifiable by a recipient of a communication.

In support of the rejection of claim1 under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Harkins (US 5657461), in the second paragraph on page 5 concerning the automatic adjustment of the **content** of the automatically generated media to reflect characteristics of the chosen media, and in his Response to Arguments, the examiner points out in effect that Harkins discloses a system that can change the contents of an automatically generated communication so that it may be sent by a selected media - such as facsimile, e-mail or printer.

If the word “content” is interpreted (overly) broadly to mean the overall structure of the communication then the examiner appears correct that the overall content is changeable to enable the communication to be sent by either of the different channels. For example, a different set of rules and formatting is required to send a document to a laser printer than is required to send a letter to a mobile telephone. However, such interpretation is very different from the correct interpretation of the term “content” as used in the application, in which “content” means the text and data of the final communication which the receiver receives and which is changed according to whether the communication is sent by any particular media.

For example, if the communication is a HTML message, the text can be amended to read “please click on the attached link”, but if the communication is sent through the post this same passage of text can read “please refer to the attached documents”.

The system taught by Harkins does not offer this functionality and claim 1 has been amended to emphasize the correct interpretation of “content” as used in the application-

“and wherein the text and data content of the automatically generated

communication is automatically changed depending on the characteristic of the chosen media so that differences in text and data content between communications are identifiable by a recipient of a communication”.

Thus, the claim language qualifies the term “content” and such qualification makes it clear that the final communication received by a user will, in practice, appear visually different in text and data content depending upon the media selected. This limitation is in contrast to the device taught by Harkins which merely changes the content of a communication so that it is deliverable by one or more channels but does not change the information content of the communication having regard to the chosen channel.

It is submitted, therefore, that the claims are neither anticipated by, nor obvious over the teaching of the primary reference.

Furthermore, the claimed limitation is not believed present in the secondary references and, therefore, the claims cannot be considered to be obvious over any combination of teachings of the applied references.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the claims define patentable subject matter and favorable reconsideration of the application is requested.

On page 2 of the office action, the certified copy of UK 0323625.4, from which priority is claimed in 10/706867, filed on even date to the present application, has been requested in addition to the certified copy of UK 0323623.9 - the only application from which priority is claimed in the present application. Clarification has been requested.

Respectfully submitted,
/Robert W.J. Usher/
Robert W.J. Usher
Customer 04518; reg 30932
212 633 1076